

PATENT COOPERATION TREATY

1-3-400

From the
INTERNATIONAL PRELIMINARY EXAMINING AUTHORITY

<p>To:</p> <p>Brown, Andrew Stephen RECKITT BENCKISER PLC Group Patents Department Dansom Lane Hull HU8 7DS GRANDE BRETAGNE</p>	<div style="border: 2px solid black; padding: 5px; width: fit-content; margin: 0 auto;"> <p>RECEIVED</p> <p>27 FEB 2004</p> <p>RECKITT BENCKISER</p> <p>GROUP PATENTS DEPT</p> </div>	<p>TO: <i>ASB</i></p> <p>TO: <i>dm 27/2/04</i></p> <p>CASE NUMBER</p> <p>PCT 11101P6 WO</p> <p>DIARY <i>dm</i></p> <p>WRITTEN OPINION <i>dm</i></p> <p>RECORDS <i>dm</i></p> <p>INVOICE</p> <p>ACKNOWLEDGEMENT</p> <p>27.02.2004</p> <p>RENEWALS</p>
---	---	---

<p>Applicant's or agent's file reference</p> <p>11101P6 WO/AB</p>	<p>REPLY DUE</p> <p>within 3 month(s) from the above date of mailing</p>
<p>International application No.</p> <p>PCT/GB 03/03447</p>	<p>International filing date (day/month/year)</p> <p>07.08.2003</p>
<p>Priority date (day/month/year)</p> <p>14.08.2002</p>	
<p>International Patent Classification (IPC) or both national classification and IPC</p> <p>C11D1/65</p>	
<p>Applicant</p> <p>RECKITT BENCKISER N.V.</p>	

1. This written opinion is the **first** drawn up by this International Preliminary Examining Authority.
2. This opinion contains indications relating to the following items:

I	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Basis of the opinion
II	<input type="checkbox"/>	Priority
III	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Non-establishment of opinion with regard to novelty, inventive step and industrial applicability
IV	<input type="checkbox"/>	Lack of unity of invention
V	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Reasoned statement under Rule 66.2(a)(ii) with regard to novelty, inventive step or industrial applicability; citations and explanations supporting such statement
VI	<input type="checkbox"/>	Certain documents cited
VII	<input type="checkbox"/>	Certain defects in the international application
VIII	<input type="checkbox"/>	Certain observations on the international application
3. The applicant is hereby **invited to reply** to this opinion.

When? See the time limit indicated above. The applicant may, before the expiration of that time limit, request this Authority to grant an extension, see Rule 66.2(d).

How? By submitting a written reply, accompanied, where appropriate, by amendments, according to Rule 66.3. For the form and the language of the amendments, see Rules 66.8 and 66.9.

Also: For an additional opportunity to submit amendments, see Rule 66.4.
For the examiner's obligation to consider amendments and/or arguments, see Rule 66.4 bis.
For an informal communication with the examiner, see Rule 66.6.

If no reply is filed, the international preliminary examination report will be established on the basis of this opinion.
4. The final date by which the international preliminary examination report must be established according to Rule 69.2 is: **14.12.2004**

<p>Name and mailing address of the international preliminary examining authority:</p> <div style="text-align: center;"> </div> <p>European Patent Office - P.B. 5818 Patentlaan 2 NL-2280 HV Rijswijk - Pays Bas Tel. +31 70 340 - 2040 Tx: 31 651 epo nl Fax: +31 70 340 - 3016</p>	<p>Authorized Officer</p> <p>Bertran Nadal, J</p> <p>Formalities officer (incl. extension of time limits)</p> <p>Janzing, M</p> <p>Telephone No. +31 70 340-4140</p> <div style="text-align: right;"> </div>
--	--

I. Basis of the opinion

1. With regard to the **elements** of the international application (*Replacement sheets which have been furnished to the receiving Office in response to an invitation under Article 14 are referred to in this opinion as "originally filed"*):

Description, Pages

1-27 as originally filed

Claims, Numbers

1-11 as originally filed

2. With regard to the **language**, all the elements marked above were available or furnished to this Authority in the language in which the international application was filed, unless otherwise indicated under this item.

These elements were available or furnished to this Authority in the following language: , which is:

- ☐ the language of a translation furnished for the purposes of the international search (under Rule 23.1(b)).
- ☐ the language of publication of the international application (under Rule 48.3(b)).
- ☐ the language of a translation furnished for the purposes of international preliminary examination (under Rule 55.2 and/or 55.3).

3. With regard to any **nucleotide and/or amino acid sequence** disclosed in the international application, the international preliminary examination was carried out on the basis of the sequence listing:

- ☐ contained in the international application in written form.
- ☐ filed together with the international application in computer readable form.
- ☐ furnished subsequently to this Authority in written form.
- ☐ furnished subsequently to this Authority in computer readable form.
- ☐ The statement that the subsequently furnished written sequence listing does not go beyond the disclosure in the international application as filed has been furnished.
- ☐ The statement that the information recorded in computer readable form is identical to the written sequence listing has been furnished.

4. The amendments have resulted in the cancellation of:

- ☐ the description, pages:
- ☐ the claims, Nos.:
- ☐ the drawings, sheets:

5. ☐ This opinion has been established as if (some of) the amendments had not been made, since they have been considered to go beyond the disclosure as filed (Rule 70.2(c)).

6. Additional observations, if necessary:

III. Non-establishment of opinion with regard to novelty, inventive step and industrial applicability

1. The questions whether the claimed invention appears to be novel, to involve an inventive step (to be non-obvious), or to be industrially applicable have not been and will not be examined in respect of:

WRITTEN OPINIONInternational application No. **PCT/GB 03/03447**

- ☐ the entire international application,
- ☒ claims Nos. 1-9, 11 (all partially)
because:
- ☐ the said international application, or the said claims Nos. relate to the following subject matter which does not require an international preliminary examination (specify):
- ☐ the description, claims or drawings (*indicate particular elements below*) or said claims Nos. are so unclear that no meaningful opinion could be formed (*specify*):
- ☐ the claims, or said claims Nos. are so inadequately supported by the description that no meaningful opinion could be formed.
- ☒ no international search report has been established for the said claims Nos. 1-9, 11 (all partially)
2. A written opinion cannot be drawn due to the failure of the nucleotide and/or amino acid sequence listing to comply with the Standard provided for in Annex C of the Administrative Instructions:
- ☐ the written form has not been furnished or does not comply with the Standard.
- ☐ the computer readable form has not been furnished or does not comply with the Standard.

V. Reasoned statement under Rule 66.2(a)(ii) with regard to novelty, inventive step or industrial applicability; citations and explanations supporting such statement

1. Statement

Novelty (N)	Claims	1, 2, 5, 8-11
Inventive step (IS)	Claims	3, 4, 6, 7
Industrial applicability (IA)	Claims	

2. Citations and explanations

see separate sheet

Re Item III

Non-establishment of opinion with regard to novelty, inventive step and industrial applicability

The Applicant's attention is drawn to the fact that claims, or parts of claims, relating to inventions in respect of which no international search report has been established need not be the subject of an international preliminary examination (Rule 66(e) PCT).

Re Item V

Reasoned statement under Rule 66.2(a)(ii) with regard to novelty, inventive step or industrial applicability; citations and explanations supporting such statement

Reference is made to the following documents:

D1: US-A-3553141

D2: CH-A4-91966

D3: GB-A-1066795

D4: US-A-4001394

1. The documents D1-D4 disclose detergent compositions comprising (a) a bactericide surfactant in its salt form, the anion being a saccharinate, (b) an anionic surfactant, (c) water. The concentration of ingredients (a), (b) and (c) fall within the range of present claim 1 (cf. D1: column 2 lines 8-27, column 3 lines 17-24, examples 2, 3; D2: column 3 line 4-column 4 line 14, example 2; D3: page 2 lines 9-42, examples 16,28; D4: column 1 line 58-column 2 line 13, column 3 lines 30-42).

The compositions can be used for the treatment and disinfection of textiles (cf. D1: column 2 lines 28-35, example 2; D2: column 4 lines 50-61).

The subject-matter of claims 1, 11 is therefore not new (Article 33(2)PCT).

2. Dependent claims 2-10 do not contain any features which, in combination with the features of any claim to which they refer, meet the requirements of the PCT in respect of novelty and/or inventive step, the reasons being as follows:

2.1 The features of dependent claim 2 have already been employed for the same purpose in a similar detergent composition, see document D4.

2.2 The features of dependent claim 5 have already been employed for the same purpose in a similar detergent composition, see document D3.

**WRITTEN OPINION
SEPARATE SHEET**

International application No. PCT/GB03/03447

2.3 The features of dependent claims 8-10 have already been employed for the same purpose in a similar detergent composition, see document D1.

2.4 In claims 3, 4, 6, 7 a slight change in the composition of claim 1 is defined which comes within the scope of the customary practice followed by persons skilled in the art, especially as the advantages thus achieved can readily be foreseen.